

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY	3
II. DESCRIPTION OF VERIZON MA'S COLLOCATION SECURITY PROPOSAL	6
A. Applicable Law	10
III. ARGUMENT	14
A. Limiting Access in Verizon MA's COs and RTs Is Necessary To Protect Both Verizon's and Collocators' Networks.	15
B. The Incidence of Security Breaches in Massachusetts and Other Jurisdictions Justifies the Need to Limit Access in Verizon MA's COs.	20
C. Verizon MA's Collocation Security Proposal Is A Reasonable, Proactive Means of Minimizing the Potential for Network Harm.	23
1. Requiring Separate and Secured Space, For All Types of Physical Collocation	24
2. Requiring Relocation of Unsecured CCOE Arrangements or Conversion to Virtual Collocation	30
3. Requiring Separate Entrances and/or Pathways to Physical Collocation Areas	32
4. Providing Reasonable Access to Shared Facilities	35
5. Requiring Virtual Collocation at RT Locations	37
6. Requiring Virtual Collocation at Critical Offices	39
D. Verizon MA's Enhancement of Its Existing Security Methods Alone Is Inadequate As a Preventive Measure.	42
1. Requiring Background Checks Prior to Issuing Non-Verizon Employee Identification Cards	43
2. Expanding Deployment of CRAS to Provide Access to Verizon MA's COs.	46
3. Other Security Measures	50

E.	The Other Parties Present No Viable Alternatives that Would Enhance Security of the Network Infrastructure	52
F.	Virtual Collocation Is Recognized As A Viable Arrangement.	54
G.	Verizon MA's Collocation Security Proposal Does Not Differ From Those Employed By Other Telecommunications Carriers.	58
IV.	CONCLUSION	59